Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

On the condition number of equality constrained indefinite least squares problem

Shaoxin Wang · **Hu Yang**

arXiv:1611.05949v1 [math.NA] 18 Nov 2016

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, based on a novel definition of the condition number, the expression of the relative condition number of equality constrained indefinite least squares problem is first presented when the data space is measured by a general product norm. Then, by setting the specific norms and parameters, we obtain the explicit expressions of the normwise, mixed and componentwise condition numbers, and we also present two equivalent but simpler expressions of the normwise condition number. Moreover, when the problem is structured, the corresponding structured relative condition numbers are also taken into consideration, and their expressions are given. To estimate these condition numbers effectively and reliably, the probabilistic spectral norm estimator and the small-sample statistical condition estimation method are applied and three related algorithms are devised. Finally, the obtained results are illustrated by numerical experiments.

Keywords the equality constrained indefinite least squares problem · product norm · Kronecker product · condition number · PCE method · SCE method

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 15A12 · 15A60 · 65F20 · 65F35 · 65F30

1 Introduction

The equality constrained indefinite least squares (EILS) problem can be stated as follows

$$\text{EILS}: \quad \min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} (b-Ax)^T J(b-Ax) \quad \text{subject to } Bx=d, \tag{1}$$

where $A\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is full column rank, $B\in\mathbb{R}^{s\times n}$, $b\in\mathbb{R}^m$, $d\in\mathbb{R}^s$, and J is a signature matrix defined as $J=\begin{bmatrix} I_p & 0 \\ 0 & -I_q \end{bmatrix}$ with $p+q=m$. The EILS problem can be reduced to the indefinite least squares (ILS)

The work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11171361, 11201507).

S. Wang (✉)
College of Mathematics and Statistics, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 401331, P. R. China
E-mail: shaoxin.w@gmail.com

H. Yang
College of Mathematics and Statistics, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 401331, P. R. China
E-mail: yh@cqu.edu.cn

problem by removing the equality constraints or equality constrained least squares (ELS) problem by setting $J = I$. Herein, we let $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $\mathbb{R}^p$ stand for the sets of $m \times n$ real matrices and p dimension column vectors, respectively. A^T denotes the transpose of A, whereas I_r the identity matrix of order r. To facilitate our discussion, we make the following assumptions on the EILS problem

$$\text{rank}(B) = s, \text{ and } x^T(A^T JA)x > 0 \text{ for all nonzero } x \in \mathscr{N}(\mathscr{B}), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathscr{N}(\mathscr{B})$ denotes the null space of B. The first condition implies that the constraint equation admits a solution. The second one, imposing the positive definiteness of $A^T JA$ on $\mathscr{N}(\mathscr{B})$, ensures the EILS problem (1) has a unique solution [4,31]. Moreover, the positive definiteness of $A^T JA$ and $\dim(\mathscr{N}(\mathscr{B})) = n - s$ imply

$$p \geq n - s,$$

and, under the assumptions (2), the solution to EILS problem satisfies the following augmented system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & B \\ 0 & J & A \\ B^T & A^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ Jr \\ x \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d \\ b \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{3}$$

where $r = b - Ax$ and $-\lambda = B^{\dagger T} A^T Jr$ with $B^\dagger$ being the Moore-Penrose inverse of B is the the vector of the Lagrange multipliers. A detailed discussion on the conditions for the solvability of EILS problem is refereed to [31]. It should be noted that when the equality constraints are removed, from (1) we get the ILS problem which finds its applications in solving total least squares (TLS) problem [20] and the area of optimization known as H^∞-smoothing [14, 35]. Thus, both EILS and ILS problems have invoked many researchers to investigate its algorithms, stability of algorithms, and perturbation analysis (e.g., [3–5, 26–30, 36])

The main purpose of the paper is to study the condition numbers of EILS problem and its estimation. Although the topic is not new [25, 28, 31], the results in the literature are not easy to derive or involving Kronecker product which may introduce sparse matrix and lead to a waste of storage space. In this paper, by defining a generic condition number, we include the normwise, mixed and componentwise condition numbers into the same framework, and we also introduce a technique to cope with the normwise condition number which removes the Kronecker product and makes the process of deriving condition number more straightforward. Furthermore, since the structured condition number has some underlying superiorities than the unstructured one when the data is structured, and been studied by many authors for different problems (see e.g. [6, 33, 34, 38]), we also consider the structured condition number of EILS problem in this paper. As pointed in [2] and [15, Chapt. 15], we prefer to an acceptable estimated condition number that needs less computational complexity than an exact one but requiring much computational burden. Thus, we also devise some stochastic methods to estimate the condition number.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some notation and preliminaries. In Section 3, we obtain the expression of the relative condition number in a general form, and present its special cases. Section 4 mainly focuses on the structured relative condition numbers of the EILS problem. Considering that computing a condition number may be expensive, in Section 5 we provide some stochastic condition estimators of the results given in Sections 3 and 4 based on the probabilistic spectral norm estimator by Hochstenbach [18] and the small-sample statistical condition estimation (SSCE) method by Kenney and Laub [21]. The numerical experiments used for illustrating the obtained results are given in Section 6. Finally, we present the conclusion of the whole paper.

2 Notation and preliminaries

Following [37], we define the entry-wise division between the vectors $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $b = [b_1, \cdots, b_p]^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by

$$\frac{a}{b} = \mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(b)a, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(b)$ is a diagonal matrix with elements $b_1^{\ddagger}, \cdots, b_p^{\ddagger}$ on its diagonal. Here, for a number $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $c^{\ddagger}$ is defined as

$$c^{\ddagger} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c}, & c \neq 0, \\ 1, & c = 0\,. \end{cases}$$

By (4), we now present a new and general definition of the relative condition number, which may be treated as a generalization of the one given in [37].

Definition 1 Let $F : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ be a continuous map defined on an open set $Dom(F) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the domain of definition of F. Then the relative condition number of F at $x \in Dom(F)$ is defined by

$$\kappa_F(x) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{\left\| \frac{\Delta x}{\beta} \right\|_{\mu} \leq \delta} \frac{\left\| \frac{F(x+\Delta x) - F(x)}{\xi} \right\|_{\nu}}{\left\| \frac{\Delta x}{\beta} \right\|_{\mu}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mu}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\nu}$ are the vector norms defined on $\mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbb{R}^q$, respectively, and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^q$ are parameters with a requirement that if some element of β is zero, then the corresponding element of Δx must be zero.

Remark 1 When we set β to be the data x, the requirement on β in Definition 1 means that the zero elements of x do not perturb. This should make sense, because in the floating point number system a real number α can be represented as $fl(\alpha) = \alpha(1+\delta)$ with $|\delta| < \mu$, where μ is the unit roundoff [15, pp. 38]. Thus, when $\alpha = 0$, we are using the absolute error to substitute the relative error, which should make sense and the Definition 1 is reasonable in practice.

Remark 2 The condition number in Definition 1 is very general due to the flexible choices of the vector norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mu}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\nu}$, and the parameters β and ξ, and hence covers several popular condition numbers. For example, when $\mu = \nu = 2$, and $\beta = [\|x\|_2, \cdots, \|x\|_2]^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $x \neq 0$ and $\xi = [\|F(x)\|_2, \cdots, \|F(x)\|_2]^T \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $F(x) \neq 0$, we get the definition of the normwise condition number given in [9, 32]; when $\mu = \nu = \infty$, and $\beta = x \neq 0$ and $\xi = [\|F(x)\|_{\infty}, \cdots, \|F(x)\|_{\infty}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ($\xi = F(x)$) with $F(x) \neq 0$, the definition of the mixed (componentwise) condition number given in [10, 37] follows. Moreover, the parameters β and ξ can be positive real numbers instead of vectors in Definition 1. In this case, the entry-wise division between vectors reduces to the regular scalar multiplication between a scalar and a vector.

The 'vec' operator and Kronecker product play important roles in obtaining the expression of relative condition number. We introduce some necessary results on these two tools as follows.

For a matrix $A = [a_1, \cdots, a_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the 'vec' operator is defined as

$$\mathrm{vec}(A) = [a_1^T, \cdots, a_n^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{mn},$$

and the Kronecker product between $A=(a_{ij})\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $B\in\mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$ is defined as (e.g., [19, Chapt. 4]),

$$A\otimes B=\begin{bmatrix} a_{11}B & a_{12}B & \cdots & a_{1n}B \\ a_{21}B & a_{22}B & \cdots & a_{2n}B \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1}B & a_{m2}B & \cdots & a_{mn}B \end{bmatrix}\in\mathbb{R}^{mp\times nq}.$$

From the above definition, it is easy to find that when $m=1$ and $q=1$, i.e., when A is a row vector and B is a column vector,

$$A\otimes B=BA. \tag{5}$$

The following results on the 'vec' operator and Kronecker product are from [19, Chapt. 4],

$$(A\otimes B)(C\otimes D)=(AC)\otimes(BD), \tag{6}$$
$$\mathrm{vec}(AXB)=\left(B^T\otimes A\right)\mathrm{vec}(X), \tag{7}$$

where X, C and D are of appropriate orders. Moreover, we can also find the following equalities in [19, Chapt. 4],

$$\Pi_{mn}\mathrm{vec}(A)=\mathrm{vec}(A^T), \tag{8}$$
$$\Pi_{pm}(A\otimes B)\Pi_{nq}=(B\otimes A),$$
$$(A\otimes B)\Pi_{nq}=(B\otimes A),\ \text{when } m=1, \tag{9}$$

where $\Pi_{st}\in\mathbb{R}^{st\times st}$ is the *vec-permutation matrix* which only depends on the dimensions s and t.

3 The condition number for EILS problem

In order to derive the condition number of EILS problem, we define the map F from the data space (A,B,b,d) to the solution space x by

$$\begin{aligned} F:\ &\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\times\mathbb{R}^{s\times n}\times\mathbb{R}^{m}\times\mathbb{R}^{d}\to\mathbb{R}^{n} \\ &(A,B,b,d)\to F(A,B,b,d)=x=M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}d-P^TM^{-1}A^TJb, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $M=A^TJA$, $N=BM^{-1}B^T$, $P=B^TN^{-1}BM^{-1}-I_n$, and $x=M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}d-P^TM^{-1}A^TJb$ is the unique solution to EILS problem, which can be easily derived from [31]. As discussed in [25], we can see that the map F is continuously Fréchet differentiable in the neighborhood of (A,B,b,d), and the Fréchet derivative of F at point (A,B,b,d) with respect to $(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)$, i.e., $DF(A,B,b,d)\circ(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} DF(A,B,b,d)\circ(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)=\ &M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}(\Delta d-\Delta Bx)-P^TM^{-1}A^TJ(\Delta b-\Delta Ax) \\ &-M^{-1}P(\Delta B^T\lambda+\Delta A^TJr). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Before giving the definition of EILS problem's condition number, we first define a product norm on the data space by

$$\|(A,B,b,d)\|_\mu:=\|\mathrm{vec}(A,B,b,d)\|_\eta, \tag{12}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\eta$ is any kind of vector norm, and with an abuse of notation we take $\mathrm{vec}(A,B,b,d)$ to denote the vector $[\mathrm{vec}(A)^T,\mathrm{vec}(B)^T,b^T,d^T]^T$. One can easily find that the following pairs of popular norms satisfy equation (12): $\eta=2$ and $\mu=F$, $\eta=\infty$ and $\mu=\max$, which are sufficient for our purpose.

Now, we define the relative condition number of EILS problem as follows.

Definition 2 Considering the map defined by (10), the relative condition number of EILS problem with respect to the product norm (12) on the data space is defined as

$$\kappa_F(A,B,b,d)=\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_\mu\le\delta}\frac{\left\|\frac{F(A+\Delta A,B+\Delta B,b+\Delta b,d+\Delta d)-F(A,B,b,d)}{\xi}\right\|_\nu}{\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_\mu},\tag{13}$$

where $\Phi\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $\Psi\in\mathbb{R}^{s\times n}$, $\beta\in\mathbb{R}^m$, and $\vartheta\in\mathbb{R}^s$ are parameters satisfying the requirement in Definition 1, that is, if some element of $(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)$ is zero, then the corresponding element in $(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)$ should also be zero.

By the Fréchet differentiability of F, we obtain an explicit expression of the relative condition number of EILS problem, which is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *The relative condition number of the EILS problem* (1) *is*

$$\kappa_F(A,B,b,d)=\left\|\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F\mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta))\right\|_{\eta,\nu},\tag{14}$$

where

$$\mathscr{M}_F=\left[\Gamma,\,-\Omega,\,-P^TM^{-1}A^TJ,\,M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\right]\tag{15}$$

with $\Gamma=x^T\otimes(P^TM^{-1}A^TJ)-(M^{-1}P)\otimes(Jr)^T$, $\Omega=(M^{-1}P)\otimes\lambda^T+x^T\otimes(M^{-1}B^TN^{-1})$, *and* $\|\cdot\|_{\eta,\nu}$ *being the matrix norm induced by the vector norms* $\|\cdot\|_\eta$ *and* $\|\cdot\|_\nu$.

Proof Applying the vec operator to $DF(A,B,b,d)\circ(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)$, and by (7) and (8) lead to the following expression

$$\begin{aligned}DF(A,B,b,d)\circ(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)=&\left\{x^T\otimes(P^TM^{-1}A^TJ)-\left[(Jr)^T\otimes(M^{-1}P)\right]\Pi\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\Delta A)\\&-\left\{\left[\lambda^T\otimes(M^{-1}P)\right]\Pi+x^T\otimes(M^{-1}B^TN^{-1})\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\Delta B)\\&-P^TM^{-1}A^TJ\Delta b+M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\Delta d.\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (9) and then setting $\Gamma=x^T\otimes(P^TM^{-1}A^TJ)-(M^{-1}P)\otimes(Jr)^T$ and $\Omega=(M^{-1}P)\otimes\lambda^T+x^T\otimes(M^{-1}B^TN^{-1})$, we have

$$DF(A,B,b,d)\circ(\Delta A,\Delta B,\Delta b,\Delta d)=\mathscr{M}_F\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{vec}(\Delta A)\\\mathrm{vec}(\Delta B)\\\Delta b\\\Delta d\end{bmatrix},\tag{16}$$

where $\mathscr{M}_F = \left[\Gamma,\ -\Omega,\ -P^TM^{-1}A^TJ,\ M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\right]$. According to the requirement of parameters in Definition 2, the following equality holds

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\Delta A) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\Delta B) \\ \Delta b \\ \Delta d \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)) \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}) \\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta} \\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{17}$$

Substituting (16) and (17) into (13) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_F(A,B,b,d) &= \lim_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_\mu \le \delta} \frac{\left\| \mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)) \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}) \\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta} \\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\nu}{\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_\mu} \\ &= \lim_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{\left\|\mathrm{vec}\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_\eta \le \delta} \frac{\left\| \mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)) \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}) \\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta} \\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\nu}{\left\|\mathrm{vec}\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_\eta} \\ &= \left\|\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta))\right\|_{\eta,\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 1 gives the general form of the relative condition number of EILS problem, but for practical purpose we need to specify the norms and parameters and/or derive its even simpler but equivalent expressions, which forms the following two theorems.

Theorem 2 (2-norm) *When $\eta = \nu = 2$, $\mu = F$, and the parameters Φ, Ψ, β, ϑ and ξ are positive real numbers, the relative condition number* (14) *has the following two equivalent expressions*

$$\kappa_{2F1}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\left\|\mathscr{M}_{paF}\mathscr{M}_{paF}^T\right\|_2^{1/2}}{\xi}, \tag{18}$$

where $\rho = \Phi^2\|x\|_2^2 + \beta^2$, $\sigma = \Psi^2\|x\|_2^2 + \vartheta^2$, and $\mathscr{M}_{paF}\mathscr{M}_{paF}^T = M^{-1}PSP^TM^{-1} + \Psi^2M^{-1}Px\lambda^TN^{-1}BM^{-1} + \Psi^2M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\lambda x^TP^TM^{-1} + \sigma M^{-1}B^TN^{-2}BM^{-1}$ with $S = (\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2^2 + \Phi^2\|r\|_2^2)I_n + \rho A^TA - \Phi^2xr^TA - \Phi^2A^Trx^T$, and

$$\kappa_{2F2}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\left\|\left[M^{-1}P\mathscr{Q},\ \sqrt{\sigma}M^{-1}B^TN^{-1} + \frac{\Psi^2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}M^{-1}Px\lambda^T\right]\right\|_2}{\xi}, \tag{19}$$

where $\mathscr{Q} = \left[\sqrt{\rho}A^T - \frac{\Phi^2}{\sqrt{\rho}}xr^T,\ \frac{\Phi\beta\|r\|_2}{\sqrt{\rho}}I_n,\ \frac{\Phi^2\|r\|_2\|x\|_2}{\sqrt{\rho}}\mathscr{P}_x,\ \frac{\vartheta\Psi\|\lambda\|_2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}I_n,\ \frac{\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2\|x\|_2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}\mathscr{P}_x\right]$ with $\mathscr{P}_x = \left(I_n - \frac{1}{\|x\|_2^2}xx^T\right)$.

Proof Under the hypothesis of this theorem, it can be easily derived from Theorem 1 that

$$\kappa_{2F}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\left\|\left[\Phi\Gamma,\ -\Psi\Omega,\ -\beta P^TM^{-1}A^TJ,\ \vartheta M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\right]\right\|_2}{\xi}, \tag{20}$$

where $\Gamma = x^T\otimes(P^TM^{-1}A^TJ)-(M^{-1}P)\otimes(Jr)^T$ and $\Omega = (M^{-1}P)\otimes\lambda^T + x^T\otimes(M^{-1}B^TN^{-1})$. By the fact that for any matrix $X\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $\|X\|_2 = \left\|XX^T\right\|_2^{1/2}$, we set $\mathscr{M}_{paF} = \left[\Phi\Gamma,\ -\Psi\Omega,\ -\beta P^TM^{-1}A^TJ,\ \vartheta M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\right]$ be the parameterized $\mathscr{M}$, and then the following equality holds

$$\left\|\mathscr{M}_{paF}\right\|_2 = \left\|\mathscr{M}_{paF}\mathscr{M}_{paF}^T\right\|_2^{1/2}.$$

With the equality $M^{-1}P = P^TM^{-1}$, we have

$$\Gamma\Gamma^T = M^{-1}P(\|x\|_2^2A^TA - xr^TA + \|r\|_2^2I_n - A^Trx^T)P^TM^{-1},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega\Omega^T =\ & \|\lambda\|_2^2M^{-1}PP^TM^{-1} + M^{-1}Px\lambda^TN^{-1}BM^{-1} + M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\lambda x^TP^TM^{-1}\\ & +\|x\|_2^2M^{-1}B^TN^{-2}BM^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{M}_{paF}\mathscr{M}_{paF}^T =\ & \Phi^2\Gamma\Gamma^T + \Psi^2\Omega\Omega^T + \beta^2P^TM^{-1}A^TAM^{-1}P + \vartheta^2M^{-1}B^TN^{-2}BM^{-1}\\ =\ & M^{-1}P\left((\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2^2 + \Phi^2\|r\|_2^2)I_n + (\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2)A^TA - \Phi^2xr^TA - \Phi^2A^Trx^T\right)P^TM^{-1}\\ & +\Psi^2M^{-1}Px\lambda^TN^{-1}BM^{-1} + \Psi^2M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\lambda x^TP^TM^{-1}\\ & +(\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2)M^{-1}B^TN^{-2}BM^{-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Let $S = (\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2^2 + \Phi^2\|r\|_2^2)I_n + (\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2)A^TA - \Phi^2xr^TA - \Phi^2A^Trx^T$, then we can write (21) as the following form

$$\mathscr{M}_{paF}\mathscr{M}_{paF}^T = \left[M^{-1}P\ \Psi M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}\right]\begin{bmatrix} S & \Psi x\lambda^T\\ \Psi\lambda x^T & \frac{(\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2)}{\Psi^2}I_n\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} P^TM^{-1}\\ \Psi N^{-1}BM^{-1}\end{bmatrix}.$$

By block-wise Cholesky factorization, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} S & \Psi x\lambda^T\\ \Psi\lambda x^T & \frac{(\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2)}{\Psi^2}I_n\end{bmatrix} =\ & \begin{bmatrix} I_n & \frac{\Psi^3}{(\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2)}x\lambda^T\\ 0 & I_n\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} S-\frac{\Psi^4\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T & 0\\ 0 & \frac{(\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2)}{\Psi^2}I_n\end{bmatrix}\\ & \times\begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0\\ \frac{\Psi^3}{(\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2)}\lambda x^T & I_n\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Since $S-\frac{\Psi^4\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T = (\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2)A^TA - \Phi^2xr^TA - \Phi^2A^Trx^T + (\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2^2+\Phi^2\|r\|_2^2)I_n - \frac{\Psi^4\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T$, in a similar manner, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}S-\frac{\Psi^4\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T =\ & \left[A^T - \frac{\Phi^2}{\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2}xr^T\ \ \Phi I_n\right]\\ & \times\begin{bmatrix}(\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2)I_n & 0\\ 0 & \|r\|_2^2\left(I_n-\frac{\Phi^2}{\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2}xx^T\right)+\frac{\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Phi^2}\left(I_n-\frac{\Psi^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T\right)\end{bmatrix}\\ & \times\begin{bmatrix}A-\frac{\Phi^2}{\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2}rx^T\\ \Phi I_n\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

From (23), we note that

$$I_n - \frac{\Phi^2}{\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2}xx^T = \frac{1}{\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2}\left(\beta^2 I_n + \Phi^2\|x\|_2^2\left(I-\frac{1}{\|x\|_2^2}xx^T\right)\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2}\left[\beta I_n \ \Phi\|x\|_2\left(I-\tfrac{1}{\|x\|_2^2}xx^T\right)\right]\begin{bmatrix}\beta I_n\\ \Phi\|x\|_2\left(I-\frac{1}{\|x\|_2^2}xx^T\right)\end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, with some algebra, we can factorize $S-\frac{\Psi^4\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T$ as follows

$$S-\frac{\Psi^4\|\lambda\|_2^2}{\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2}xx^T = \mathscr{Q}\mathscr{Q}^T, \tag{24}$$

where $\mathscr{Q}=\left[\sqrt{\rho}A^T-\frac{\Phi^2}{\sqrt{\rho}}xr^T,\ \frac{\Phi\beta\|r\|_2}{\sqrt{\rho}}I_n,\ \frac{\Phi^2\|r\|_2\|x\|_2}{\sqrt{\rho}}\mathscr{P}_x,\ \frac{\vartheta\Psi\|\lambda\|_2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}I_n,\ \frac{\Psi^2\|\lambda\|_2\|x\|_2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}\mathscr{P}_x\right]$, with $\rho=\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2$, $\sigma=\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2+\vartheta^2$, and $\mathscr{P}_x=\left(I_n-\frac{1}{\|x\|_2^2}xx^T\right)$. Just substituting (24) into (22) and repeating the process of deriving (24), we have

$$\mathscr{M}_{paF}\mathscr{M}_{paF}^T = \mathscr{K}\mathscr{K}^T,$$

where $\mathscr{K}=\left[M^{-1}P\mathscr{Q},\ \sqrt{\sigma}M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}+\frac{\Psi^2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}M^{-1}Px\lambda^T\right]$. □

Remark 3 Note that both (18) and (19) eliminate the Kronecker Product, and the orders of the matrices in (20), (18) and (19) are $n\times(n+1)(m+s)$, $n\times n$, and $n\times(4n+m+s)$, respectively. Hence, when m, n, and s are very large, both of the expressions (18) and (19) can significantly reduce the storage requirements. However, forming the matrix in (18) explicitly is not very desirable because computing the matrix cross product A^TA may be potentially unstable [15, pp. 386]. Therefore, in comparison, the expression (19) seems to be more preferred.

Remark 4 The 2-norm condition number of EILS problem has been considered by some scholars, such as, in [31] the author gives an upper bound of the condition number, which involves the Kronecker product; Liu et al. [28] and Wang [36] consider the perturbation theory of ILS problem with least squares constraints, from which the normwise condition number can be obtained, but their approach is quite different from ours.

As pointed in Introduction, we can get the corresponding results for ILS problem and ELS problem without any difficulty. Here we just present the results for ILS problem. The corresponding ones for ELS problem follows easily just by setting $J=I$.

Corollary 1 *Let $B=\Psi=0$ and $d=\vartheta=0$. When $\eta=\nu=2$, $\mu=F$, and the parameters Φ, β, and ξ are positive real numbers, the relative condition number of ILS problem is given by*

$$\kappa_{2ILS}(A,b)=\frac{\left\|\left[\Phi\Gamma_1,\beta M^{-1}A^TJ\right]\right\|_2}{\xi},$$

where $\Gamma_1=M^{-1}\otimes(Jr)^T-x^T\otimes(M^{-1}A^TJ)$. Then, we also have the the following two equivalent expressions

$$\kappa_{2ILS}(A,b)=\frac{\left\|M^{-1}\left(\Phi^2\|r\|_2^2I_n+\left(\Phi^2\|x\|_2^2+\beta^2\right)A^TA-\Phi^2(xr^TA+A^Trx^T)\right)M^{-1}\right\|_2^{1/2}}{\xi}$$

and

$$\kappa_{2ILS}(A,b)=\frac{\left\|M^{-1}\left[\sqrt{\rho}A^T-\frac{\Phi^2}{\sqrt{\rho}}xr^T,\ \frac{\Phi\beta\|r\|_2}{\sqrt{\rho}}I_n,\ \frac{\Phi^2\|r\|_2\|x\|_2}{\sqrt{\rho}}\mathscr{P}_x\right]\right\|_2}{\xi}.$$

Now we consider the relative condition number with $\eta=\nu=\infty$ and $\mu=\max$ for the EILS problem (1), from which the relative mixed and componentwise condition numbers follow directly.

Theorem 3 (∞-norm) *When $\eta=\nu=\infty$ and $\mu=\max$, the relative condition number of the EILS problem (1) is given by*

$$\kappa_{\infty F}(A,B,b,d)=\left\|\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F\mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta))\right\|_\infty=\left\|\frac{|\mathscr{M}_F|\,|\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)|}{|\xi|}\right\|_\infty,\tag{25}$$

where $\mathscr{M}_F$ is defined by (15).

Proof Letting $\eta=\nu=\infty$ in (14) gives the first part of (25). The second part of (25) can be obtained by considering the proof of Lemma 2 in [7] and (4), which is straightforward, so we omit it here. □

Remark 5 When we set $(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)=(A,B,b,d)$, and then taking $\xi=[\|x\|_\infty,\cdots,\|x\|_\infty]^T$ and $\xi=x$ in sequence, the mixed and componentwise condition numbers of EILS problem follow correspondingly,

$$\kappa_{mF}(A,B,b,d)=\frac{\||\mathscr{M}_F|\,|\mathrm{vec}(A,B,b,d)|\|_\infty}{\|x\|_\infty},\tag{26}$$

$$\kappa_{cF}(A,B,b,d)=\left\|\frac{|\mathscr{M}_F|\,|\mathrm{vec}(A,B,b,d)|}{|x|}\right\|_\infty,\tag{27}$$

which can be derived from the results given by Li et al. [25] in considering the ILS problem with least squares constraints. Following their steps, the upper bounds containing no Kornecker product of EILS problem can be obtained readily. Since the corresponding results for ILS problem have been given in [25], we just list out the upper bounds for EILS problem.

$$\kappa_{mF}(A,B,b,d)\le\frac{\left\||M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}|(|d|+|B||x|)+|P^TM^{-1}A^TJ|(|b|+|A||x|)+|M^{-1}P|(|B^T||\lambda|+|A^T||Jr|)\right\|_\infty}{\|x\|_\infty},$$

$$\kappa_{cF}(A,B,b,d)\le\left\|\frac{|M^{-1}B^TN^{-1}|(|d|+|B||x|)+|P^TM^{-1}A^TJ|(|b|+|A||x|)+|M^{-1}P|(|B^T||\lambda|+|A^T||Jr|)}{|x|}\right\|_\infty.$$

4 The structured condition number of EILS problem

In the preceding section, no concentration was put on the structure of the data. If the data process some specific structures, a finer characterization of the relative condition number can be available.

Let $\mathbb{S}_1\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $\mathbb{S}_2\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{s\times n}$, $\mathbb{S}_3\subseteq\mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathbb{S}_4\subseteq\mathbb{R}^s$ be linear subspaces. Each of the former two subspace consists of a class of matrices having the same structure, here we only consider the following structures

$$\mathbb{S}_{i=1,2}\in\{\text{ sym, persym, skewsym, symToep, Toep, circ, Hankel, persymHankel }\},$$

the set of symmetric, persymmetric, skewsymmetric, symmetric Toeplitz, general Toeplitz, circulant, Hankel, and persymmetric Hankel matrices [33], while the latter two comprise two classes of structured vectors, respectively. According to [17, 24, 33], we have that if $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$, $B \in \mathbb{S}_2$, $b \in \mathbb{S}_3$ and $d \in \mathbb{S}_4$, then

$$\mathrm{vec}(A) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} s_1, \quad \mathrm{vec}(B) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} s_2, \quad b = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} s_3, \quad \mathrm{vec}(d) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4} s_4,$$

where $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times k_1}$, $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{sn \times k_2}$, $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k_3}$, and $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times k_4}$ are the fixed matrices used to reflect the structures of these four linear subspaces, and s_1, s_2, s_3, and s_4 are the vectors containing the elements to form the corresponding structured matrices and vectors.

Now, in a similar way as (13), we present the definition of the structured relative condition number for EILS problem (1) as follows.

$$\kappa_F^S(A,B,b,d) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{\substack{\left\| \left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}, \frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}, \frac{\Delta b}{\beta}, \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \right) \right\|_\mu \le \delta \\ \Delta A, \Phi \in \mathbb{S}_1, \Delta B, \Psi \in \mathbb{S}_2 \\ \Delta b, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_3, \Delta d, \vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_4}} \frac{\left\| \frac{F(A+\Delta A, B+\Delta B, b+\Delta b, d+\Delta d) - F(A,B,b,d)}{\xi} \right\|_\nu}{\left\| \left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}, \frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}, \frac{\Delta b}{\beta}, \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \right) \right\|_\mu}, \tag{28}$$

where $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times n}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^s$ are parameters satisfying the requirement in Definition 1, that is, if some element of $(\Delta A, \Delta B, \Delta b, \Delta d)$ is zero, then the corresponding element in $(\Phi, \Psi, \beta, \vartheta)$ should also be zero. Since it is difficult to take supremum over the structured data space [33], in the following, we mainly focus on some specific norms to tackle this problem.

Firstly, we set $\eta = \nu = 2$ and $\mu = F$. In this situation, substituting (16) and (17) into (28) gives

$$\kappa_{2F}^S(A,B,b,d) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{\substack{\left\| \left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}, \frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}, \frac{\Delta b}{\beta}, \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \right) \right\|_F \le \delta \\ \Delta A, \Phi \in \mathbb{S}_1, \Delta B, \Psi \in \mathbb{S}_2 \\ \Delta b, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_3, \Delta d, \vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_4}} \frac{\left\| \mathrm{diag}^\ddagger(\xi) \mathscr{M}_F \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi, \Psi, \beta, \vartheta)) \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}) \\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta} \\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2}{\left\| \left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}, \frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}, \frac{\Delta b}{\beta}, \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \right) \right\|_F}, \tag{29}$$

Since $\Delta A, \Phi \in \mathbb{S}_1$, $\Delta B, \Psi \in \mathbb{S}_2$, $\Delta b, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_3$, and $\Delta d, \vartheta \in \mathbb{S}_4$, based on the explanation at the beginning of this section, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{vec}(\Delta A) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} \Delta s_1, \quad \mathrm{vec}(\Phi) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} \phi, \quad \Delta b = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} \Delta s_3, \quad \beta = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} \theta, \\ &\mathrm{vec}(\Delta B) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} \Delta s_2, \quad \mathrm{vec}(\Psi) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} \varphi, \quad \Delta d = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4} \Delta s_4, \quad \vartheta = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4} \rho, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\Delta s_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1}$, $\Delta s_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$, $\Delta s_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_3}$, and $\Delta s_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_4}$ are the corresponding perturbations of s_1, s_2, s_3, and s_4, and $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1}$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{k_3}$, and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{k_4}$ can be interpreted as the vectors of the parameters used to give Φ, Ψ, β, and ϑ, respectively. Thus, according to (4) and from (30), we can get

$$\mathrm{vec}\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}\right) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} \frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}, \quad \mathrm{vec}\left(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}\right) = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}, \quad \frac{\Delta b}{\beta} = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}, \quad \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} = \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4} \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho},$$

which can be written together as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi}) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi}) \\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta} \\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi} \\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi} \\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta} \\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{31}$$

Since

$$\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_F = \left\|\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi})\\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi})\\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta}\\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_2$$
$$= \left\|\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}\\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}\end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}^T\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1} & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}^T\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}^T\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}^T\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}\\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_2^{1/2}$$

and the structured matrices $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}$, $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}$, $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}$ and $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}$ are column orthogonal [24],

$$\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_F = \left\|\begin{bmatrix}D_1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & D_2 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & D_3 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D_4\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}\\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_2, \tag{32}$$

where $D_1=\mathrm{diag}(w_1)$, $D_2=\mathrm{diag}(w_2)$, $D_3=\mathrm{diag}(w_3)$, and $D_4=\mathrm{diag}(w_4)$ with

$$w_1=[\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}(:,1)\|_2,\cdots,\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}(:,k_1)\|_2]^T,\quad w_2=[\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}(:,1)\|_2,\cdots,\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}(:,k_2)\|_2]^T,$$
$$w_3=[\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}(:,1)\|_2,\cdots,\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}(:,k_3)\|_2]^T,\quad w_4=[\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}(:,1)\|_2,\cdots,\|\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}(:,k_4)\|_2]^T.$$

Here, the Matlab notation is used, i.e., $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_i}(:,k_i)$ is the k_i-th column of $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_i}$. We for clarity set $\Delta h=\begin{bmatrix}D_1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & D_2 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & D_3 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D_4\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}\\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}\end{bmatrix}$,

and combine (29), (31), and (32) to give

$$\kappa_{2F}^S(A,B,b,d)=\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{\|\Delta h\|_2\le\delta}\frac{\left\|\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F\mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta))\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}D_2^{-1} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}D_3^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}D_4^{-1}\end{bmatrix}\Delta h\right\|_2}{\|\Delta h\|_2}. \tag{33}$$

Here, since $\begin{bmatrix}D_1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & D_2 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & D_3 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & D_4\end{bmatrix}$ is nonsingular, for the above equation, we can take the supremum over all the parameter $\Delta h\in\mathbb{R}^{k_1+k_2+k_3+k_4}$ with $\|\Delta h\|_2\le\delta$, and hence get the following theorem.

Theorem 4 (Structured 2-norm) *Let $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$, $B \in \mathbb{S}_2$, $b \in \mathbb{S}_3$, and $d \in \mathbb{S}_4$. Then the structured relative condition number under 2-norm of the EILS problem (1) is given by*

$$\kappa_{2F}^{S}(A,B,b,d) = \left\| \operatorname{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F \operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{vec}(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)) \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}D_2^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}D_3^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}D_4^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2, \quad (34)$$

where $\mathscr{M}_F$ is defined by (15).

If the parameters Φ, Ψ, β, ϑ and ξ are positive real numbers, then

$$\kappa_{2F}^{S}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\left\| \left[\Phi\Gamma\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1},\ -\Psi\Omega\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}D_2^{-1},\ -\beta P^T M^{-1}A^T J\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}D_3^{-1},\ \vartheta M^{-1}B^T N^{-1}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}D_4^{-1} \right] \right\|_2}{\xi}. \quad (35)$$

Remark 6 It is easy to verify that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}D_2^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}D_3^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}D_4^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is column orthonormal. Thus,

$$\kappa_{2F}^{S}(A,B,b,d) \le \kappa_{2F}(A,B,b,d),$$

which means that the structured 2-norm relative condition number (34) is always smaller than the unstructured one (20). It should be of interest to investigate the ratio $\kappa_{2F}^{S}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{2F}(A,B,b,d)$ as done in [33, 34, 38]. We won't consider this topic in this paper, and only provide a numerical example to verify that the structured condition numbers are indeed smaller than the corresponding unstructured ones.

Remark 7 It should be pointed out that the expression (35) can not be simplified with the same techniques used in Theorem 2 due to the existence of $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_i}D_i^{-1}$, and we also note that the matrix $\Phi\Gamma\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1}$ is of order $n \times k_1$ which is not large, but the process of computing it involves Kronecker product. We may use the following procedure to avoid computing the Kronecker product, if necessary. Here we only present the main idea, the rest can be done similarly. Let 'uvec' be the inverse operator of 'vec' and $\Upsilon = P^T M^{-1}A^T J$, then

$$\left[x^T \otimes \Upsilon\right]\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1} = \left[\Upsilon\operatorname{uvec}\left((\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1})(:,1)\right)x,\ \cdots,\ \Upsilon\operatorname{uvec}\left((\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1})(:,k_1)\right)x\right].$$

This can be easily done with the `reshape` function in Matlab.

In the same way, the structured 2-norm relative condition number of ILS problem can be obtained by setting $B = \Psi = 0$ and $d = \vartheta = 0$.

Corollary 2 *Let $B = \Psi = 0$ and $d = \vartheta = 0$. When $\eta = \nu = 2$, $\mu = F$, the structured relative 2-normwise condition number of the ILS problem is*

$$\kappa_{2ILS}^{S}(A,b) = \left\| \operatorname{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\left[\Gamma_1, M^{-1}A^T J\right]\operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{vec}(\Phi,\beta)) \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}D_3^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2,$$

where $\Gamma_1 = M^{-1} \otimes (Jr)^T - x^T \otimes (M^{-1}A^T J)$.

If the parameters Ψ, β, and ξ are positive real numbers, then

$$\kappa_{2ILS}^{S}(A,b) = \frac{\left\| \left[\Phi\left(M^{-1} \otimes (Jr)^T - x^T \otimes (M^{-1}A^T J)\right)\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}D_1^{-1}, \beta M^{-1}A^T J\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}D_3^{-1}\right] \right\|_2}{\xi}.$$

Now we set $\eta = \nu = \infty$ and $\mu = \max$. In this case, the technique used for deriving (32) doesn't work any more. But, considering the properties of the structure matrices $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_i}$ [33, pp. 10] and the definition of the ∞-norm, and by (31) we have

$$\left\|\left(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi},\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi},\frac{\Delta b}{\beta},\frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\right)\right\|_{\max} = \left\|\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta A}{\Phi})\\ \mathrm{vec}(\frac{\Delta B}{\Psi})\\ \frac{\Delta b}{\beta}\\ \frac{\Delta d}{\vartheta}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_{\infty} = \left\|\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0&0&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}&0&0\\0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}&0\\0&0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}\\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_{\infty}$$
$$= \left\|\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}\\ \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}\\ \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_{\infty}. \tag{36}$$

Setting $\Delta s = \left[\frac{\Delta s_1}{\phi}^T, \frac{\Delta s_2}{\varphi}^T, \frac{\Delta s_3}{\theta}^T, \frac{\Delta s_4}{\rho}^T\right]^T$ and substituting (16), (17), (31) and (36) into (28) yield

$$\kappa^S_{\infty F}(A,B,b,d) = \lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{\|\Delta s\|_\infty\le\delta}\frac{\left\|\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0&0&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}&0&0\\0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}&0\\0&0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\mathrm{diag}\left(\mathrm{vec}(\phi,\varphi,\beta,\rho)\right)\Delta s\right\|_\infty}{\|\Delta s\|_\infty},$$

which makes us be able to take the supremum over all the parameter $\Delta s \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1+k_2+k_3+k_4}$ with $\|\Delta s\| \le \delta$. Thus, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 5 (Structured ∞-norm) *Let $A \in \mathbb{S}_1$, $B \in \mathbb{S}_2$, $b \in \mathbb{S}_3$, and $d \in \mathbb{S}_4$. Then the structured relative condition number under ∞-norm for the EILS problem (1) is*

$$\kappa^S_{\infty F}(A,B,b,d) = \left\|\mathrm{diag}^{\ddagger}(\xi)\mathscr{M}_F\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0&0&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}&0&0\\0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}&0\\0&0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\mathrm{diag}\left(\mathrm{vec}(\phi,\varphi,\beta,\rho)\right)\right\|_\infty \tag{37}$$
$$= \left\|\frac{\left|\mathscr{M}_F\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0&0&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}&0&0\\0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}&0\\0&0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\right|\left|\begin{bmatrix}\phi\\ \varphi\\ \theta\\ \rho\end{bmatrix}\right|}{|\xi|}\right\|_\infty, \tag{38}$$

where $\mathscr{M}_F$ is defined by (15).

In particular, setting $\Phi = A$, $\Psi = B$, $\beta = b$, and $\vartheta = d$, i.e., $\phi = s_1$, $\varphi = s_2$, $\theta = s_3$, and $\rho = s_4$, and then taking $\xi = [\|x\|_\infty, \cdots, \|x\|_\infty]^T$ and $\xi = x$ in sequence, we have the structured mixed and componentwise

condition number

$$\kappa_{mF}^{S}(A,B,b,d)=\frac{\left\|\left|\mathscr{M}_F\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0&0&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}&0&0\\0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}&0\\0&0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\right|\left|\begin{bmatrix}s_1\\s_2\\s_3\\s_4\end{bmatrix}\right|\right\|_\infty}{\|x\|_\infty} \tag{39}$$

and

$$\kappa_{cF}^{S}(A,B,b,d)=\left\|\frac{\left|\mathscr{M}_F\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0&0&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_2}&0&0\\0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}&0\\0&0&0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_4}\end{bmatrix}\right|\left|\begin{bmatrix}s_1\\s_2\\s_3\\s_4\end{bmatrix}\right|}{|x|}\right\|_\infty. \tag{40}$$

Remark 8 All the structures involved in the above are linear. It is interesting to consider the structured condition numbers for the EILS problem under nonlinear structures as done by Cucker and Diao [6] for the Moore-Penrose inverse and the LLS problem. However, in that case, in order to take supremum over the data space, we may need other different methods to derive the equalities like (32) and (36).

As its special case, the structured relative condition number under ∞-norm of ILS problem is presented in the following corollary.

Corollary 3 *Let $A\in\mathbb{S}_1$ and $b\in\mathbb{S}_3$. Then the structured relative condition number under ∞-norm for the ILS problem is*

$$\kappa_{\infty ILS}^{S}(A,b)=\left\|\frac{\left|\left[\Gamma_1,M^{-1}A^TJ\right]\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}\end{bmatrix}\right|\left|\begin{bmatrix}\varphi\\\theta\end{bmatrix}\right|}{|\xi|}\right\|_\infty,$$

where $\Gamma_1=M^{-1}\otimes(Jr)^T-x^T\otimes(M^{-1}A^TJ)$.

In particular, setting $\Psi=A$ and $\beta=b$, i.e., $\varphi=s_1$ and $\theta=s_3$, and then taking $\xi=[\|x\|_\infty,\cdots,\|x\|_\infty]^T$ and $\xi=x$ in sequence, we have the structured mixed and componentwise condition number

$$\kappa_{mILS}^{S}(A,b)=\frac{\left\|\left|\left[\Gamma_1,M^{-1}A^TJ\right]\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}\end{bmatrix}\right|\left|\begin{bmatrix}s_1\\s_3\end{bmatrix}\right|\right\|_\infty}{\|x\|_\infty}$$

and

$$\kappa_{cILS}^{S}(A,b)=\left\|\frac{\left|\left[\Gamma_1,M^{-1}A^TJ\right]\begin{bmatrix}\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_1}&0\\0&\Phi_{\mathbb{S}_3}\end{bmatrix}\right|\left|\begin{bmatrix}s_1\\s_3\end{bmatrix}\right|}{|x|}\right\|_\infty.$$

5 Statistical condition estimates

In this part, we consider two different methods for estimating the condition numbers of EILS problem under 2 and ∞ norms.

5.1 Estimating condition number under 2-norm

According to Theorem 2, the main task to estimate $\kappa_{2Fi=1,2}(A,B,b,d)$ lies in how to obtain a reliable estimate of the spectral norm of a matrix. This can be done by the probabilistic spectral norm estimator [18]. Meanwhile, a quite different approach based on the SSCE method [21] can also be applied. In the following, we present brief introductions of these two methods and the corresponding algorithms.

PCE method The probabilistic spectral norm estimator was proposed by Hochstenbach [18], which provides a good estimate of the spectral norm of a matrix. More precisely, a detailed analysis of the estimator in [18] showed that the spectral norm of a matrix can be contained in a small interval $[\alpha_1,\alpha_2]$ with high probability. Here, α_1 is the guaranteed lower bound of the spectral norm derived by the famous Lanczos bibdiagonalization method [11] and α_2 is an probabilistic upper bound with probability at least $1-\varepsilon$ with ε being user-chosen and far less than 1. The probabilistic upper bound α_1 is obtained in finding the largest zero of Lanczos polynomials. Moreover, we can keep $\alpha_2/\alpha_1 \le 1+\delta$ with δ being another user-chosen parameter. Based on this estimator, Algorithm 1 for estimating the relative condition number (19) is devised.

Algorithm 1 Probabilistic condition estimation

1. Compute the matrix
$$S = \left[M^{-1}P\mathscr{Q},\ \sqrt{\sigma}M^{-1}B^TN^{-1} + \frac{\Psi^2}{\sqrt{\sigma}}M^{-1}Px\lambda^T\right]$$
and choose a starting random vector v_0 from $\mathscr{U}(S_{4n+m+s-1})$, the uniform distribution over unit sphere $S_{4n+m+s-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{4n+m+s}$.
2. Compute the guaranteed lower bound α_1 and the probabilistic upper bound α_2 of $\|S\|_2$ by the probabilistic spectral norm estimator.
3. Estimate the relative condition number (19) by
$$\kappa_{pce2F}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2\xi}.$$

Remark 9 It is well-known that directly computing the inverse of a matrix is expensive, and from [18], we know that in performing the probabilistic spectral norm estimator, what we really need is the product of the a vector, say v_0, with matrix S or S^T, but the explicit form of S. Thus, we can avoid computing M^{-1} and N^{-1} in (19) by solving series of linear system, and furthermore this process can also use the intermediate results in solving EILS problem, for example, if the EILS problem is solved by generalized hyperbolic QR factorization [4], then the expression of (19) will contain triangular matrices, which may improve the efficiency of the estimator. In addition, we also find that Algorithm 1 can be applied to estimate the structured relative condition number (34) without any difficulty.

SSCE method In [2], an approach based on the SSCE method [13, 21] is employed to estimate the normwise condition number for the LLS problem, and showed to perform quite well. Now we apply the approach to estimate the condition number (20). Denote by $\kappa_{i2F}(A,B,b,d)$ the relative condition number

under 2-norm of the function $z_i^T x$, where z_is are chosen from $\mathscr{U}(S_{n-1})$ and are orthogonal. Following the same line in [2], we for clarity set $\mathscr{H} = Px\lambda^T N^{-1}B$ and get

$$\kappa_{i2F}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\sqrt{z_i^T M^{-1}\left(PSP^T + \Psi^2\mathscr{H} + \Psi^2\mathscr{H}^T + (\Psi^2\|x\|_2^2 + \vartheta^2)B^T N^{-2}B\right)M^{-1}z_i}}{\xi}. \tag{41}$$

The analysis in [2] shows that

$$\kappa_{ssce2F}(A,B,b,d) = \frac{\omega_k}{\omega_n}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\kappa_{i2F}(A,B,b,d)^2} \tag{42}$$

is a good estimate of the condition number (20) with k to be the number of random sample vectors from $\mathscr{U}(S_{n-1})$. In the above expression, ω_k is the Wallis factor with $\omega_1 = 1$, $\omega_2 = 2/\pi$, and

$$\omega_k = \begin{cases} \frac{1\cdot 3\cdot 5\cdots(k-2)}{2\cdot 4\cdot 6\cdots(k-1)}, & \text{for } k \text{ odd}, \\ \frac{2}{\pi}\frac{2\cdot 4\cdot 6\cdots(k-2)}{3\cdot 5\cdot 7\cdots(k-1)}, & \text{for } k \text{ even}, \end{cases} \quad \text{when } k > 2.$$

It can be approximated by

$$\omega_k \approx \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi(k-\frac{1}{2})}} \tag{43}$$

with high accuracy. In summary, we can propose Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Small-sample statistical normwise condition estimation

1. Generate k vectors $z_1,\cdots,z_k$ from $\mathscr{U}(S_{n-1})$, and orthonormalize these vectors using the QR facotization.
2. For $i = 1,\cdots,k$, compute $\kappa_{i2F}(A,B,b,d)$ by (41).
3. Approximate ω_k and ω_n by (43) and estimate the condition number (20) by (42).

5.2 **Estimating condition numbers under ∞-norm**

For the mixed and componentwise condition numbers, we consider the SSCE method [13, 21], which has been used to estimate the condition numbers for the linear systems, the LLS problem, and the matrix functions (e.g. [2, 8, 22, 23]). As done in the aforementioned references, we devise Algorithm 3 to estimate the condition numbers $\kappa_{mF}(A,B,b,d)$ and $\kappa_{cF}(A,B,b,d)$ in (26) and (27), which corresponds to Algorithm 2 in [23]. Moreover, the method to avoid Kronecker product given in Remark 7 can be used here.

Algorithm 3 Small-sample statistical mixed and componentwise condition estimation

1. Let $t=(n+1)(m+s)$. Generate k vectors $\widetilde{z}_1,\cdots,\widetilde{z}_k$ from $\mathscr{U}(S_{t-1})$, and orthonormalize these vectors using the QR facotization.
2. For $i=1,\cdots,k$, let $z_i=\widetilde{z}_i\circ \mathrm{vec}(A,B,b,d)$, where $\circ$ denotes the Hadamard product (see, e.g., [19, Chapt. 5]).
3. Compute $u_i=\mathscr{M}_F z_i$, and estimate the mixed and componentwise condition numbers in (26) and (27) by

$$\kappa_{sscemF}(A,B,b,d)=\frac{\|\kappa_{ssce}\|_\infty}{\|x\|_\infty},\quad \kappa_{sscecF}(A,B,b,d)=\left\|\frac{\kappa_{ssce}}{x}\right\|_\infty,$$

where $\kappa_{ssce}=\frac{\omega_k}{\omega_t}\left|\sum_{i=1}^k|u_i|^2\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and the power and square root operation are performed on each entry of u_i, $i=1,\cdots,k$.

6 Numerical experiments

In this section, all the numerical experiments are performed in Matlab 7.9 with machine precision 2.2×10^{-16}. We present two examples, the first one is used to examine the efficiency of the algorithms we proposed, while the second is to show the difference of the structured and unstructured condition numbers.

Example 1 In order to test the performance of the condition estimators, adapting the idea in [4] we construct the EILS problem by following generalized hyperbolic QR decomposition. Precisely speaking, the coefficient matrices A and B admit the following decompositions

$$A=H\begin{bmatrix}L_{11} & 0\\ L_{21} & L_{22}\end{bmatrix}Q^T \text{ and } BQ=\begin{bmatrix}K & 0\end{bmatrix},$$

where H is J-orthogonal, i.e., $H^TJH=J$, Q is orthogonal, and $L_{22}\in\mathbb{R}^{(n-s)\times(n-s)}$ and $K\in\mathbb{R}^{s\times s}$ are lower triangular and nonsingular. In our experiment, we let L_{11} be random matrix with full column rank and L_{21} be arbitrary random matrix. H is random J-orthogonal matrix with specified condition number and generated via the method given in [16]. Q, L_{22}, and K are generated by QR factorization of random matrices with specified condition numbers and pre-assigned singular value distributions. Therefore, we can keep B have a specific condition number, and A's condition number in certain order of magnitude. Then, we set the solution $x=(0,\cdots,0,1,2^2,\cdots,(n-s)^2)^T\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $d=Bx$, and $b=Ax+r$ with r being random vector of 2-norm ω, i.e., $\|r\|_2=\omega$. We get the vector of the Lagrange multipliers $-\lambda$ by equation (3).

In implementation, we set $p=50$, $q=30$, $n=40$, and $s=20$. The parameters are set to be $(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)$ with all elements being 1 for normwise condition number, while $(\Phi,\Psi,\beta,\vartheta)=(A,B,b,d)$ for mixed and componentwise condition numbers. It can be easily checked our setup satisfies the assumptions (2). For Algorithm 1, we choose the parameters $\delta=0.01$ and $\varepsilon=0.001$, which means that the inequalities $\alpha_1\le\|S\|_2\le\alpha_2$ hold with a probability at least 99.9%, and α_1 and α_2 satisfy the inequality $\alpha_2/\alpha_1\le1.01$. For Algorithms 2 and 3, we set $k=3$. By varying the condition numbers of A and B, and the 2-norm of the residual vector r, we use 200 EILS problems for each group of A, B, and r to test the performance of the algorithms. In order to give a quantitative measurement of the efficiency of statistical condition estimators, we define the ratios between the estimate and the exact values as follows

$$r_{pn}=\kappa_{pce2F}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{2F}(A,B,b,d),\ r_{sn}=\kappa_{ssce2F}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{2F}(A,B,b,d),$$
$$r_{sm}=\kappa_{sscemF}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{mF}(A,B,b,d),\ r_{sc}=\kappa_{sscecF}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{cF}(A,B,b,d),$$

and report the mean and variance of these ratios in Table 1 and Table 2.

From the numerical results, one in general can find that all the three algorithms can give reliable estimate. Here the 'reliable' means the estimate of the condition number is within a factor 10. From Table 1, we note

Table 1 The efficiency of normwise condition estimators

cond(A)≈		10^1		10^2		10^4	
cond(B)=s^0		mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{-4}$	r_{pn}	1.000e+000	4.657e-007	1.001e+000	1.542e-006	1.001e+000	1.706e-006
	r_{sn}	2.685e+000	6.949e-002	3.218e+000	1.184e-001	3.095e+000	1.128e-001
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{0}$	r_{pn}	1.000e+000	6.839e-007	1.001e+000	1.646e-006	1.001e+000	2.293e-006
	r_{sn}	2.704e+000	9.769e-002	3.196e+000	9.625e-002	3.080e+000	1.021e-001
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{4}$	r_{pn}	1.002e+000	2.145e-007	1.000e+000	3.413e-009	1.000e+000	1.497e-012
	r_{sn}	4.828e+000	9.513e-002	4.866e+000	7.609e-002	4.890e+000	8.394e-002
cond(B)=s^2		mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{-4}$	r_{pn}	1.000e+000	8.974e-011	1.000e+000	9.079e-011	1.000e+000	1.432e-011
	r_{sn}	1.532e+000	1.163e-001	1.506e+000	1.083e-001	2.192e+000	1.164e-001
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{0}$	r_{pn}	1.000e+000	4.298e-008	9.999e-001	9.119e-007	1.000e+000	1.511e-008
	r_{sn}	1.522e+000	1.298e-001	1.542e+000	1.074e-001	4.368e+000	1.379e-001
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{4}$	r_{pn}	1.002e+000	3.510e-006	1.000e+000	5.413e-008	1.000e+000	8.722e-012
	r_{sn}	4.866e+000	8.953e-002	4.858e+000	8.887e-002	4.850e+000	8.943e-002
cond(B)=s^4		mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{-4}$	r_{pn}	1.001e+000	1.822e-006	1.001e+000	1.774e-006	1.001e+000	1.645e-006
	r_{sn}	1.263e+000	1.501e-001	1.274e+000	1.427e-001	1.241e+000	1.235e-001
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{0}$	r_{pn}	1.001e+000	1.727e-006	1.001e+000	2.015e-006	1.000e+000	2.305e-011
	r_{sn}	1.282e+000	1.237e-001	1.319e+000	1.367e-001	4.147e+000	2.937e-001
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{4}$	r_{pn}	1.001e+000	2.875e-006	1.000e+000	1.084e-007	1.000e+000	7.543e-011
	r_{sn}	4.827e+000	9.891e-002	4.866e+000	7.910e-002	4.882e+000	6.787e-002

Table 2 The efficiency of mixed and componentwise condition estimators

cond(A)≈		10^1		10^2		10^4	
cond(B)=s^0		mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{-4}$	r_{sm}	1.037e+000	4.014e-002	8.290e-001	3.200e-002	8.570e-001	2.537e-002
	r_{sc}	9.878e-001	4.014e-002	7.783e-001	3.200e-002	8.131e-001	2.537e-002
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{0}$	r_{sm}	1.045e+000	3.436e-002	8.571e-001	3.495e-002	8.254e-001	2.852e-002
	r_{sc}	9.842e-001	3.436e-002	8.021e-001	3.495e-002	7.699e-001	2.852e-002
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{4}$	r_{sm}	7.453e-001	1.338e-002	7.334e-001	1.555e-002	7.414e-001	2.246e-002
	r_{sc}	6.944e-001	1.338e-002	6.969e-001	1.555e-002	6.986e-001	2.246e-002
cond(B)=s^2		mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{-4}$	r_{sm}	1.042e+000	3.426e-002	8.316e-001	2.081e-002	8.276e-001	2.387e-002
	r_{sc}	9.870e-001	3.426e-002	7.808e-001	2.081e-002	7.734e-001	2.387e-002
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{0}$	r_{sm}	1.022e+000	2.913e-002	8.099e-001	2.157e-002	8.417e-001	2.735e-002
	r_{sc}	9.787e-001	2.913e-002	7.823e-001	2.157e-002	8.084e-001	2.735e-002
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{4}$	r_{sm}	7.556e-001	1.368e-002	7.399e-001	1.321e-002	7.398e-001	2.437e-002
	r_{sc}	7.037e-001	1.367e-002	6.768e-001	1.321e-002	7.002e-001	2.437e-002
cond(B)=s^4		mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{-4}$	r_{sm}	1.033e+000	3.801e-002	8.307e-001	2.688e-002	8.240e-001	2.067e-002
	r_{sc}	9.951e-001	3.801e-002	7.862e-001	2.688e-002	7.940e-001	2.067e-002
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{0}$	r_{sm}	1.030e+000	4.126e-002	8.075e-001	2.775e-002	8.284e-001	2.169e-002
	r_{sc}	9.798e-001	4.126e-002	7.824e-001	2.775e-002	7.942e-001	2.169e-002
$\|r\|_2 = 10^{4}$	r_{sm}	7.425e-001	1.365e-002	7.273e-001	1.097e-002	7.357e-001	1.696e-002
	r_{sc}	7.053e-001	1.365e-002	6.822e-001	1.097e-002	6.895e-001	1.696e-002

that the PCE method seems to be more stable than SSCE method for its small variances. Moreover, we can also find an interesting phenomenon that when the residual become large, the SSCE method tends to overestimate the normwise condition number, while underestimate the mixed and componentwise condition numbers. A suitable theoretical explanation is not easy to give here, due to the complicated expressions of condition estimators. Under the same condition, we increase the norm of residual up to 10^{10} which is not list in the tables, and find that the ratios does not change much and still in the reliable sense.

Example 2 The matrix A in this example is formed as $A = \left[A_1^T,\ \frac{1}{2}A_1^T\right]^T$, where $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is a nonsymmetric gaussian random Toeplitz matrix generated by the Matlab's function $\texttt{toeplitz}(c,r)$ with $c = \texttt{randn}(n,1)$ and $r = \texttt{randn}(n,1)$, $B = \left[B_1,\ 0\right]$ with B_1 also being a nonsymmetric gaussian random Toeplitz matrix, and the solution x and the residual vector r are the same as the ones in Example 1. For the above setting, $m = 2n$, $n = 2s$, and the structures on b and d are not considered. Meanwhile, we set $p = q = n$ in J. In this case, the assumptions given in (2) will be satisfied when A_1 and B_1 are nonsingular. Moreover, with a direct calculation the relationships (32)and (36) are still hold.

In the practical experiments, we set $s = 15$, and generate 100 ILS problems for each ω. The numerical results on the ratios defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_N &= \kappa_{2F}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{2F}^S(A,B,b,d),\\
r_M &= \kappa_{mF}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{mF}^S(A,B,b,d),\\
r_C &= \kappa_{cF}(A,B,b,d)/\kappa_{cF}^S(A,B,b,d),
\end{aligned}
$$

are presented in Figures 1. These results confirm the theoretical analysis in Remark 6, we can find that



Fig. 1 Comparison of structured and unstructured condition numbers (the blue dot line is the ratio equals to 1)

in some cases the unstructured 2-norm condition number can be 40 times larger than the structured one. Moreover, we also note that although the unstructured mixed and componentwise condition numbers are

larger than structured ones, they perform more stable compared with the normwise condition number, which confirms the necessity for the study of mixed and componentwise condition numbers in some sense.

7 Concluding remark

Base on a new and general definition of condition number and a general product norm, this paper presents an explicit expression of the relative condition number for the EILS problem. Then, as its special case, the relative 2-normwise, mixed and componentwise condition numbers are presented. Furthermore, two simplified but equivalent expressions of 2-normwise condition number are also be given. Corresponding to the unstructured relative condition numbers, the structured ones are derived. Finally, the stochastic estimates of the derived condition numbers and the corresponding algorithms are provided. Numerical experiments show that these estimates are efficient and reliable. Meanwhile, a numerical example also confirms that the structured condition numbers can be numerically much smaller than the unstructured ones.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Prof. Michiel E. Hochstenbach for providing Matlab program of the probabilistic spectral norm estimator.

References

1. Baboulin, M., Gratton, S.: A contribution to the conditioning of the total least-squares problem. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **32**, 685–699 (2011)
2. Baboulin, M., Gratton, S., Lacroix, R., Laub, A. J.: Statistical estimates for the conditioning of linear least squares problems. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., **8384**, 124–133 (2014)
3. Bojanczyk, A.W., Higham, N.J., Patel, H.: Solving the indefinite least squares problem by hyperbolic QR factorization. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **24**, 914–931 (2003)
4. Bojanczyk, A.W., Higham, N.J., Patel, H.: The equality constrained indefinite least squares problem: theory and algorithms. BIT **43**, 505–517 (2003)
5. Chandrasekaran, S., Gu, M., Sayed, A.H.: A stable and efficient algorithm for the indefinite linear least-squares problem. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **20**, 354–362 (1998)
6. Cucker, F., Diao, H.: Mixed and componentwise condition numbers for rectangular structured matrices. Calcolo **44**, 89–115 (2007)
7. Cucker, F., Diao, H., Wei, Y.: On mixed and componentwise condition numbers for Moore-Penrose inverse and linear least squares problems. Math. Comp. **76**, 947–963 (2007)
8. Diao, H., Xiang, H., Wei, Y.: Mixed, componentwise condition numbers and small sample statistical condition estimation of Sylvester equations. Numer. Linear Algebra Appl. **19**, 639–654 (2012)
9. Geurts, A.J.: A contribution to the theory of condition. Numer. Math. **39**, 85–96 (1982)
10. Gohberg, I., Koltracht, I.: Mixed, componentwise, and structured condition numbers. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **14**, 688–704 (1993)
11. Golub, G.H., Kahan, W.: Calculating the singular values and pseudo-inverse of a matrix. J. Soc. Indust Appl. Math. Ser. B Numer. Anal. **2**, 205–224 (1965)
12. Golub, G.H., Van Loan, C.F.: An analysis of the total least squares problem. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **17**, 883–893 (1980)
13. Gudmundsson, T., Kenney, C.S., Laub, A.J.: Small-sample statistical estimates for matrix norms. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **16**, 776–792 (1995)
14. Hassibi, B., Sayed, A.H., Kailath, T.: Linear estimation in Krein spaces–part I: Theory. IEEE Trans. Automat. Control **41**, 18–33 (1996)
15. Higham, N.J.: Accuracy and Stability of Numerical Algorithms. 2nd ed., SIAM, Philadelphia, (2002)
16. Higham, N.J.: J -Orthogonal matrices: properties and generation. SIAM Rev. **45**(3), 504–519 (2003)
17. Higham, D.J., Higham, N.J.: Backward error and condition of structured linear systems. SIAM J. MatrixAnal. Appl. **13**, 162–175 (1992)

18. Hochstenbach, M.E.: Probabilistic upper bounds for the matrix two-norm. J. Sci. Comput. **57**, 464–476 (2013)
19. Horn, R.A., Johnson, C.R.: Topics in Matrix Analysis. Cambridge University Press, New York, (1991)
20. Huffel, S.V., Vandewalle, J.: The Total Least Squares Problem: Computational Aspects and Analysis. SIAM, Philadelphia, (1991)
21. Kenney, C.S., Laub, A.J.: Small-sample statistical condition estimates for general matrix functions. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **15**, 36–61 (1994)
22. Kenney, C.S., Laub, A.J., Reese, M.S.: Statistical condition estimation for linear systems. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **19**, 566–583 (1998)
23. Kenney, C.S., Laub, A.J., Reese, M.S.: Statistical condition estimation for linear least squares. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **19**, 906–923 (1998)
24. Li, B., Jia, Z.: Some results on condition numbers of the scaled total least squares problem. Linear Algebra Appl. **435**, 674–686 (2011)
25. Li, H., Wang, S., Yang, H.: On mixed and componentwise condition numbers for indefinite least squares problem. Linear Algebra Appl. **448**, 104–129 (2014)
26. Liu, Q., Li, X.: Preconditioned conjugate gradient methods for the solution of indefinite least squares problems. Calcolo **48**, 261–271 (2011)
27. Liu, Q., Pan, B.Z., Wang, Q.: The hyperbolic elimination method for solving the equality constrained indefinite least squares problem. Int. J. Comput. Math. **87**, 2953–2966 (2010)
28. Liu, Q., Wang, M.: Algebraic properties and perturbation results for the indefinite least squares problem with equality constraints. Int. J. Comput. Math. **87**, 425–434 (2010)
29. Mastronardi, N., Van Dooren, P.: An algorithm for solving the indefinite least squares problem with equality constraints. BIT **54**, 201-218 (2014)
30. Mastronardi, N., Van Dooren, P.: A structurally backward stable algorithm for solving the indefinite least squares problem with equality constraints. IMA J. Numer. Anal. **35**, 107–132 (2015)
31. Patel, H.: Solving the indefinite least squares problem. Ph.D Thesis, University of Manchester, (2002)
32. Rice, J.R.: A theory of condition. SIAM J. Numer. Anal.**3**, 287–310 (1966)
33. Rump, S.M.: Structured perturbations. Part I: Normwise distances. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **25**, 1–30 (2003)
34. Rump, S.M.: Structured perturbation. Part II: Componentwise distances. SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **25**, 31–56 (2003)
35. Sayed, A.H., Hassibi, B., Kailath, T.: Inertia properties of indefinite quadratic forms. IEEE Signal Process. Lett. **3**, 57–59 (1996)
36. Wang, Q.: Perturbation analysis for generalized indefinite least squares problems. J. East China Norm. Univ. Natur. Sci. Ed. **4**, 47–53 (2009)
37. Xie, Z., Li, W., Jin, X.: On condition numbers for the canonical generalized polar decomposition of real matrices. Electron. J. Linear Algebra **26**, 842–857 (2013)
38. Xu, W., Wei, Y., Qiao, S.: Condition numbers for structured least squares problems. BIT **46**, 203–225 (2006)